


### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 16 and 22 are amended to recite that the levering rod is substantially linear between the pivot portion and the bent portion and that the levering rod is substantially linear between the force-receiving portion and the bent portion and that the levering rod between the force-receiving portion and the bent portion is kept at a substantially horizontal level in a rest state. Support for this amendment is found in Fig. 2(c) and paragraphs [0017] and [0023].

Applicant expresses appreciation to Examiner Hamilton for discussing this patent application on February 16 and February 27. On February 16, Examiner Hamilton explained that the new grounds of rejection raised in the Office Action were based upon a changed interpretation of the Lee et al. patent, specifically the “bent portion” disclosed by Lee et al. In the Interview Summary dated November 15, 2005, Examiner Hamilton attached Diagram 1 which labeled the “bent portion” according to Examiner Hamilton’s interpretation.



In the February 16, 2006 Interview Summary, Examiner Hamilton attached another “Diagram 1” which labeled the “bent portion” according to Examiner Hamilton’s new interpretation.





Diagram 1. Figure 2 of Lee et al labeled with the bent portion.

The Examiner did not provide any basis in Lee et al. supporting the changed interpretation. It appears the Examiner fabricated this interpretation merely provide new grounds for rejecting the patent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that a reasonable person viewing the Lee et al. patent's "non-linear levering arm" would not interpret the "bent portion" according to Examiner Hamilton, but would instead interpret the non-linear levering arm according to Applicant's interpretation as follows:



Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's interpretation of Lee et al. in accordance with the Applicant's interpretation set forth above.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103. The Office Action rejected claims 16-18 and 20-21 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Shannon. Applicant respectfully submits that when Lee et al. is correctly interpreted, the Examiner's rejection of claims 16-18 and 20-21 should be withdrawn because the depressing-force exerting portion is not "disposed only between said pivot portion and said bent portion" as recited in Claim 1.

In the event Examiner Hamilton refuses to reconsider his interpretation of the Lee et al. patent, the claims have been amended to address the Examiner's new interpretation identified in the February 16, 2006 Interview Summary and illustrated above. Specifically, claims 1 and 22 have been amended to recite that the levering rod is substantially linear between the pivot portion and the bent portion and that the levering rod is substantially linear between the force-receiving portion and the bent portion and that the levering rod between the force-receiving portion and the bent portion is kept at a substantially horizontal level in a rest state.

Applicant submits that claims 1 and 22 are clearly allowable in spite of the Examiner's new interpretation of Lee et al. The Examiner's interpretation is shown below with a line drawn between the pivot portion and the bent portion.




Diagram 1. Figure 2 of Lee et al labeled with the bent portion.

Appl. No. 10/617,083  
Amdt. dated March 23, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 31, 2006

According to the Examiner's new interpretation, the levering rod is **NOT** substantially linear between the pivot portion and the bent portion. Since this feature is also not taught by the Shannon patent, Applicant submits that the combined teachings of Lee et al. and Shannon fail to suggest the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-26. Applicant notes that claims 22-26 were not rejected in the Office Action, and these claims were not indicated as being allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Evan R. Witt  
Reg. No. 32,512  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: March 23, 2006

MADSON & AUSTIN  
Gateway Tower West  
15 West South Temple, Suite 900  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
Telephone: 801/537-1700